

## REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. In the Office Action of January 24, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Angles et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,811) (“*Angles*”) in view of *Prust* (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,623) (“*Prust*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner’s disposition below.

Applicants’ independent claim 1 claims a content managing system having a content managing portion comprising a content library for storing files of a plurality of contents provided by a content provider. A library managing means manages the content library. A customer file storing means stores the file of a content of each user to an area assigned to each user. A customer file managing means manages the customer file storing means. The content managing portion and a terminal unit of a user are connected through a network. The content managing portion is operated by the terminal unit of the user through the network so that a content linked to a page published by the content provider through the network is copied or linked from the content library to an area assigned to the user.

Claim 10, as amended, similarly claims a content managing apparatus comprising a content managing portion having a customer file storing means for storing the file of a content of each user to an area assigned to each user, and customer file managing means for managing the customer file storing means. The content managing portion is operated by a terminal unit of a user through a network so that a content linked to a page published by a content provider through the network is copied from a content library to an area assigned to the user.

Claim 19, as amended, similarly claims a content managing method, comprising the step of providing a content managing portion having a library for storing the files of a plurality of contents provided by a content provider, and a customer file storage and a customer file storage system for assigning a user area for storing the file of a content of each user to the customer file storage. The content managing portion is connected to a terminal unit of a user through a network. The content managing portion is operated by the terminal unit of the user through the network so that a content linked to a page published by the content provider through the network is copied or linked from the library to a user area in the customer file storage.

In summary, claims 1, 10 and 19 each claim subject matter relating to a content managing portion that includes a library and a customer file storage. Each user is assigned an area in the customer file storage. The file of a content of each user may be stored in an area assigned to each user. Thus, a storage area is assigned to each user in the customer file storage, and the file

of a content of each user may be stored in their respective assigned storage area. The content managing portion is operated by a terminal unit of a user, via a network, so that a content linked to a page published by a content provider through the network is copied or linked from the library to a user area in the customer file storage.

This is clearly unlike *Angles* in view of *Prust*. Referring to *Angles* Figure 4, *Angles* teaches an advertising provider computer 18, which includes an advertisement database 70, and a content provider computer 14. When a consumer computer 12 retrieves a web page 32 from the content provider computer 14 (step D), the advertisement provider computer 18 sends an advertisement from the database 70 to the consumer computer 12 to insert into the web page 32 (step F).

Thus, as acknowledged by the Examiner, *Angles* does not assign a storage area to each user. As *Angles* does not assign a storage area to each user, *Angles* could not assign a storage area to each user in a customer file storage of Applicants' claimed content managing portion. Instead, *Angles* merely teaches a consumer computer 12 (*i.e.*, a terminal) that has a local storage medium for storing a retrieved web page and advertising inserts. *Angles'* consumer computer clearly fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed content managing portion, in part because it is not operated by a terminal unit through a network.

*Prust* merely teaches a method and system for accessing a remote storage area. *Prust* allows a client computer to seamlessly access remote storage devices using standard file management routines (*i.e.*, as if the remote storage devices were local storage devices). *Prust*, Abstract. This is done by defining a virtual storage area for each user, wherein the virtual storage area includes remote memory locations and local memory locations. *Prust* fails to discuss storing content for a user from a content provider. Instead, *Prust* merely describes virtual storage in general. Further, as *Prust* fails to even relate to a content managing system, *Prust* fails to teach operating a content managing portion by the terminal unit through a network so that a content linked to a page published by the content provider through the network is copied or linked from a library to a user area in the customer file storage.

Thus, although *Prust* describes assigning a storage area for a user, *Prust* fails to even relate to managing content as claimed by Applicants. Therefore, *Angles* in view of *Prust* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed content managing portion in which content is caused to be stored in a user area responsive to a user operating a remote terminal device. One having skill in the art would not have been taught to combine *Angles* (which purposefully stores content locally at a terminal) with *Prust* (which merely teaches how to perform virtual remote

storage) to arrive at Applicants' claimed content managing portion.

Accordingly, *Angles* in view of *Prust* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 10, and 19.

Claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-27 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 10 or 19 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 10 and 19 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-27 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher P. Rauch/ (Reg. No. 45,034)  
Christopher P. Rauch  
SONNENSCHNEIDER, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box #061080  
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606-1080  
Telephone 312/876-2606  
Customer #26263  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)